

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the arguments set forth fully below. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 12-55, 58-63, 66 and 67 were previously pending in this application. Within the Office Action, Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 12-55, 58-63, 66 and 67 have been rejected. By the above amendment, Claims 1, 19, 24, 25, 29, 33, 36, 53-55, 58, 59, 61, 66 and 67 have been amended. Accordingly, Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 12-55, 58-63, 66 and 67 are currently pending.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Within the Office Action, Claim 66 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, within the Office Action it is stated that the interface window of Claim 66 merely enables a user to select various items, but does not perform any computations. By the above amendment, Claim 66 has been amended to specify that if interactive data is selected, the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are both included within the single graphical user interface window. Accordingly, Claim 66 is directed to statutory subject matter.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Within the Office Action, Claims 1, 6-9, 12, 14, 19-30, 32, 36-46, 48-55, 58, 60, 62, 63, 66 and 67 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,623,613 to Rowe et al. (hereinafter "Rowe") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931 to Alexander et al. (hereinafter "Alexander").

Rowe teaches a system for displaying programming information. Rowe teaches that programming information is presented via a schedule display having a category display, a subcategory display and a program display. As recognized within the Office Action, Rowe does not teach interactive selection or navigation of individual content items including interactive data. Rowe also does not teach displaying interactive data and program data within the schedule display.

Alexander teaches systems and methods for displaying and recording control interface with television programs, video, advertising information and program scheduling information. Alexander teaches an electronic programming guide which can include Internet web sites and online Internet chat rooms which are relevant to the program listings within a Grid Guide.

[Alexander, col. 17, lines 52-57] Alexander teaches that the viewer has the option of connecting to the Internet, such as a particular web site. [Alexander, col. 18, lines 33-37] In one embodiment, Alexander teaches that the electronic programming guide switches to full screen to display the Internet web site. [Alexander, col. 18, lines 37-39] In another embodiment, Alexander teaches that the electronic programming guide displays the Internet web site in the area of the screen previously occupied by the Grid Guide. [Alexander, col. 18, lines 39-44] Alexander does not teach displaying the Grid Guide program listings and the Internet web site together, within the electronic programming guide. Accordingly, Alexander does not teach that if interactive data is selected, the program scheduling information and the interactive data are both included within the electronic programming guide. Alexander teaches that when a web site is selected, the program listings within the Grid Guide are replaced with the web site.

As described above, Rowe does not teach including interactive data within a programming guide. As also described above, Alexander does not teach that if interactive data is selected, the program scheduling information and the interactive data are both included within the electronic programming guide. Accordingly, neither Rowe, Alexander nor their combination teach that if interactive data is selected, the program scheduling information and the interactive data are both included at the same time within a programming guide or a single graphical user interface window.

In contrast to the teachings of Rowe, Alexander and their combination, the content navigator graphical user interface system and method of the present invention enables a user to display, access and navigate among a multiplicity of internet websites and television programming channels to access a multiplicity of categories, channels and individual content of potential interest to the user. The system and method of the present invention provide comprehensive displaying of such categories, channels and individual content to enable effective access and navigation therein, while enabling the use of substantial screen area for individual content of potential interest and providing access to linked information and increasing searching capabilities. The system also enables the user to navigate and select among the categories, related channels and associated individual content, including interactive data, from the same screen. The system of the present invention further enables the user to interactively navigate in the individual content. The individual content sources include interactive data and television programming sources. If interactive data, such as a website, is selected, the representation of the channels and the interactive data are both included within the graphical user interface. As described above, neither Rowe, Alexander nor their combination teach or make obvious, that if

interactive data is selected, the program scheduling information and the interactive data are both included within the graphical user interface. As discussed above, Alexander teaches that when a web site is selected, the program listings within the Grid Guide are replaced with the web site.

The independent Claim 1 is directed to a display system comprising a single graphical user interface window. The graphical user interface window of Claim 1 includes a representation of a set of content categories, a representation of a set of channels related to a represented content category and a representation of individual content items associated with the represented set of channels, wherein the individual content items include television programming and interactive data. Within Claim 1 it is specified that the graphical user interface window enables a user to select a displayed category, to select a displayed channel related to the displayed category, and to select an individual content item associated with the displayed channel. It is further specified in Claim 1 that if interactive data is selected, the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are both included within the single graphical user interface window. As described above, neither Rowe, Alexander nor their combination teach that if the interactive data is selected, the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are both included within the single graphical user interface window. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander and their combination.

Claims 6-9, 12 and 14 are all dependent upon the independent Claim 1. As discussed above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander and their combination. Accordingly, the Claims 6-9, 12 and 14 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 19 is directed to a display system comprising a single graphical user interface window. The graphical user interface window of Claim 19 includes a representation of a set of content categories, a representation of a set of channels related to a represented content category, a representation of individual content items associated with the represented set of channels, wherein the individual content items include television programming and interactive data and means for enabling the user to select among the set of content categories, the related set of channels, and the associated individual content items. Within Claim 19 it is specified that the graphical user interface window enables a user to select a displayed category, to select a displayed channel related to the displayed category, and to select an individual content item associated with the displayed channel. It is further specified in Claim 19 that if interactive data is selected, the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are both included within the single graphical user interface window. As described above, neither Rowe,

Alexander nor their combination teach that if the interactive data is selected, the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are both included within the single graphical user interface window. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 19 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander and their combination.

Claims 20-23 are all dependent upon the independent Claim 19. As discussed above, the independent Claim 19 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander and their combination. Accordingly, the Claims 20-23 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 24 is directed to a display system comprising a single graphical user interface window. The graphical user interface window of Claim 24 includes a representation of a set of content categories, a representation of a set of channels related to a represented content category, a representation of individual content items associated with the represented set of channels, wherein the individual content items include television programming and interactive data and means for establishing an interactive data connection. Within Claim 24 it is further specified that the graphical user interface window enables a user to select a displayed category, to select a displayed channel related to the displayed category, and to select an individual content item associated with the displayed channel. It is further specified within Claim 24 that if interactive data is selected, the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are both included within the single graphical user interface window. As described above, neither Rowe, Alexander nor their combination teach that if the interactive data is selected, the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are both included within the single graphical user interface window. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 24 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander and their combination.

Claims 25-28 are all dependent upon the independent Claim 24. As discussed above, the independent Claim 24 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander and their combination. Accordingly, the Claims 25-28 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 29 is directed to a display system comprising a single graphical user interface window. The graphical user interface window of Claim 29 includes a representation of a set of content categories, a representation of a set of channels related to a represented content category and a representation of individual content items associated with the represented set of channels, wherein the individual content items include television programming, interactive data and extended content. Within Claim 29 it is specified that the

graphical user interface window enables a user to select a displayed category, to select a displayed channel related to the displayed category, to select individual content items associated with the displayed channel, and to select extended content. It is further specified within Claim 29 that if interactive data is selected, the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are both included within the singled graphical user interface window. As described above, neither Rowe, Alexander nor their combination teach that if the interactive data is selected, the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are both included within the single graphical user interface window. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 29 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander and their combination.

Claims 30 and 32 are both dependent upon the independent Claim 29. As discussed above, the independent Claim 29 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander and their combination. Accordingly, the Claims 30 and 32 are both also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 36 is directed to a display system comprising a single graphical user interface window. The graphical user interface window of Claim 36 includes a representation of a set of content categories, a representation of a set of channels related to a represented content category and a representation of individual content items associated with the represented set of channels, wherein the individual content items in each selectable channel include information that is related to the selectable channel, including television programming and interactive data. It is specified in Claim 36 that the graphical user interface window enables a user to select a displayed category, to select a displayed channel related to the displayed category, and to select an individual content item associated with the displayed channel. Within Claim 36 it is further specified that if interactive data is selected, the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are both included within the single graphical user interface window. As described above, neither Rowe, Alexander nor their combination teach that if the interactive data is selected, the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are both included within the single graphical user interface window. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 36 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander and their combination.

Claims 37-46 and 48-52 are all dependent upon the independent Claim 36. As discussed above, the independent Claim 36 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander and their combination. Accordingly, the Claims 37-46 and 48-52 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 53 is directed to a method of enabling a user to select a displayed category, to select a displayed channel related to the displayed category, and to select an individual content item associated with the displayed channel, in a system that includes a single graphical user interface window including a representation of a set of content categories, a representation of a set of channels related to a represented content category, and a representation of individual content items associated with the represented set of channels, wherein the individual content items include television programming and interactive data. The method of Claim 53 comprises displaying the representation of the content categories, enabling the user to select a desired content category, displaying the representation of a plurality of the channels in a set of channels related to the selected content category, enabling the user to navigate interactively in the individual content items and enabling the user to navigate among the representation of the content categories, the representation of the related channels, and the individual content items from the graphical user interface window. Within Claim 53 it is specified that if the user navigates to interactive data, the representation of the plurality of channels and the interactive data are both displayed within the single graphical user interface. As described above, neither Rowe, Alexander nor their combination teach that if the user navigates to interactive data, the representation of the plurality of channels and the interactive data are both displayed within the single graphical user interface. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 53 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander and their combination.

Claims 54, 55, 58, 60, 62 and 63 are all dependent upon the independent Claim 53. As discussed above, the independent Claim 53 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander and their combination. Accordingly, the Claims 54, 55, 58, 60, 62 and 63 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 66 is directed to a single graphical user interface window comprising a representation of a set of content categories, a representation of a set of channels related to a represented content category and a representation of individual content items associated with each of the channels, wherein the individual content items include television programming and interactive data. Within Claim 66 it is specified that the graphical user interface window enables a user to select a displayed category, to select a displayed channel related to the displayed category and to select an individual content item associated with the displayed channel. It is further specified in Claim 66 that if interactive data is selected, the representation of the set of the channels and the interactive data are both included within the single graphical user interface window. As described above, neither Rowe, Alexander nor their

combination teach that if interactive data is selected, the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are both included within the single graphical user interface window. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 66 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander and their combination.

The independent Claim 67 is directed to a computerized method comprising displaying a single graphical user interface window, displaying in the graphical user interface window a representation of a set of content categories, displaying in the graphical user interface window a representation of a set of channels, wherein the set of channels is associated with a displayed content category, displaying the graphical user interface window a representation of individual content items, wherein the individual content items include television programming and interactive data and receiving, via the graphical user interface window, user selections of a represented content category, a represented channel and a represented content item. Within Claim 67, it is specified that if the user selects interactive data, the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are both displayed within the single graphical user interface. As described above, neither Rowe, Alexander nor their combination teach that if interactive data is selected, the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are both included within the single graphical user interface window. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 67 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander and their combination.

Within the Office Action, Claims 3, 4, 59 and 61 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe and Alexander, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,880,768 to Lemmons et al. (hereinafter "Lemmons"). Claims 3 and 4 are both dependent upon the independent Claim 1. Claims 59 and 61 are both dependent upon the independent Claim 53. As discussed above, the independent Claims 1 and 53 are both allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander and their combination. Accordingly, the dependent Claims 3, 4, 59 and 61 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claim 31 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe and Alexander in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,532,754 to Young et al. (hereinafter "Young"). Claim 31 is dependent upon the independent Claim 29. As discussed above, the independent Claim 29 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander and their combination. Accordingly, the dependent Claim 31 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 13, 15, 18, 33-35 and 47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe and Alexander in view of U.S. Patent No.

6,240,555 to Shoff et al. (hereinafter "Shoff"). Shoff teaches an interactive entertainment system for presenting supplemental interactive content together with continuous video programs. Shoff teaches supplying supplemental interactive content presented alongside traditional broadcast programs. Shoff does not teach interactively navigating individual content within a graphical user interface which also displays the set of categories and the plurality of sets of channels. As described above, neither Rowe, Alexander nor their combination teach that if the interactive data is selected, the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are both included within the single graphical user interface window. Accordingly, neither Rowe, Alexander, Shoff nor their combination teach or make obvious, that if the interactive data is selected, the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are both included within the single graphical user interface window.

Claims 13, 15 and 18 are all dependent upon the independent Claim 1. As discussed above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander and their combination. Accordingly, the dependent Claims 13, 15 and 18 are all allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 33 is directed to a display system comprising a single graphical user interface window, that is generated by a content description language. The graphical user interface window of Claim 33 includes a representation of a set of categories, a representation of a set of channels related to a represented content category and a representation of individual content items associated with the represented set of channels, wherein the individual content items include television programming and interactive data. Within Claim 33 it is specified that the graphical user interface window enables a user to select a displayed category, to select a displayed channel related to the displayed category, and to select an individual content item associated with the displayed channel. It is further specified in Claim 33 that if interactive data is selected, the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are both included within the single graphical user interface window. As described above, neither Rowe, Alexander, Shoff nor their combination teach that if the interactive data is selected, the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are both included within the single graphical user interface window. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 33 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander, Shoff and their combination.

Claims 34 and 35 are both dependent upon the independent Claim 33. As discussed above, the independent Claim 33 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander, Shoff and

their combination. Accordingly, the dependent Claims 34 and 35 are both also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 47 is dependent upon the independent Claim 36. As discussed above, the independent Claim 36 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander and their combination. Accordingly, the dependent Claim 47 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 16 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe and Alexander in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,673,089 to Yuen et al. Claims 16 and 17 are both dependent upon the independent Claim 1. As discussed above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Alexander and their combination. Accordingly, the dependent Claims 16 and 17 are both also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

For the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be greatly appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, they are encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: April 12, 2005

By: Jonathan O. Owens
Jonathan O. Owens
Reg. No. 37,902

Attorneys for Applicants

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR § 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Date: 4/12/05 By: [Signature] - 20 -